
Child Care at Rome: The Role of Men

Author(s): Keith R. Bradley

Source: *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques*, Fall 1985, Vol. 12, No. 3 (Fall 1985), pp. 485-523

Published by: Berghahn Books

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23232403>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques*

JSTOR

Child Care at Rome: The Role of Men

Keith R. Bradley

I

At the approximate age of three, the child who was later to become the emperor Nero found himself a virtual orphan: his father, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, was dead of dropsy and his mother, the younger Agrippina, was in exile from Rome on a political charge.¹ Thus it was, so Suetonius records, that the child was reared in the household of his father's sister, Domitia Lepida, supervised by two pedagogues, a dancer and a barber.² The time Nero spent in his aunt's household was probably short for Agrippina was not long in exile, and once restored to the mainstream of Roman life she remarried and provided a stepfather for her son in the person of C. Sallustius Passienus Crispus; later still, a second stepfather for the young Nero emerged, when Agrippina subsequently married the emperor Claudius as part of her strategy to lead her child to the emperorship itself.³ Nevertheless, despite Agrippina's marriages,

Keith Bradley is associate professor of classics at the University of Victoria where he teaches ancient history. For comments and advice the author is grateful to Samuel E. Scully, Peter L. Smith and, in particular, Susan M. Treggiari.

1. For the background see most recently Miriam T. Griffin, *Nero: The End of a Dynasty* (New Haven, 1985), pp. 26-27.

2. Suet. *Nero* 6.3, "et subinde matre etiam relegata paene inops atque egens apud amitam Lepidam nutritus est sub duobus paedagogis saltatore atque tonsore." The verb should not have educational connotations, especially in view of Nero's age, but see Miriam T. Griffin, *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* (Oxford, 1976), p. 63; she regards the pedagogues as men "of scandalous incompetence," which may be an exaggerated judgement. R.M. Geer, "Notes on the Early Life of Nero," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 62 (1931):61 commented as follows on Suetonius' reference to the pedagogues: "this...is just the kind of picturesque but unimportant detail we expect from him." My disagreement with this view will quickly become apparent.

3. For the chronology of Nero's "orphanage," see K.R. Bradley, *Suetonius' Life of Nero: An Historical Commentary* (Brussels, 1978), pp. 48-50. For Agrippina's marriages, see Griffin, *Nero*, pp. 28-29.

Nero continued in early life to be served by other attendants, notably two men named Beryllus and Anicetus. Josephus records that the former was a pedagogue of Nero before he gained the administrative position of *ab epistulis Graecis* (which he was holding c. A.D. 55/56, apparently not without influence on the emperor), while Suetonius and Tacitus respectively refer to the latter as Nero's *paedagogus* or *educator* before he similarly rose to become commander of the imperial fleet at Misenum early in Nero's reign.⁴ The elevation of servants to posts of considerable governmental importance is striking, though it was not an unusual type of progression.

The precise functions fulfilled for Nero by the dancer, the barber, Beryllus, and Anicetus are not recorded in the sources, though perhaps Beryllus at least was one of the teaching pedagogues of whom Suetonius knew.⁵ But for appreciation of the structures of upper-class Roman family life and for knowledge of how aristocratic Roman children were reared, it is of interest to note the existence of Nero's male attendants, men who were undoubtedly all of servile origin.⁶ While the need for child care during Nero's "orphanage" is obvious, Suetonius implies that such work was not the primary responsibility of Domitia Lepida, Nero's aunt, so much as of servants at her disposal. And even when both parents were alive and not separated from their children, it was indeed common to have underlings on hand, drawn from the *familia*, for the day-to-day tending of upper-class children: Agrippina herself, for instance, had at least two nurses for the infant Nero, Egloge and Alexandria (Suet. *Nero* 50). The appearance of female nurses in the service of aristocratic families is not really surprising,⁷ but the use of men is rather less predictable at first blush. Thus, in the context of Roman family history and child-rearing practices, it is the aim of this paper to collect, describe, and analyze evidence that refers specifically to male child-minders at Rome, men, that is, described in literary and epigraphical sources as *nutritores*, *educatores*, and *paedagogi*. What can be learned of such men, and what was their social role?

4. For Beryllus, see Jos. *Ant.* 20.182-184 and for Anicetus, see Suet. *Nero* 35.2; Tac. *Ann.* 14.3. Cf. Griffin, *Seneca*, pp. 63, 67 n. 3, 87-88; Griffin, *Nero*, pp. 32, 46.

5. Suet. *Nero* 22.1; cf. Bradley, *Commentary*, pp. 285-286. There is no reason why the barber and the dancer should not have had two simultaneous jobs.

6. On Beryllus, see Fergus Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (London, 1977), pp. 226, 378. Tac. *Ann.* 14.3 specifies that Anicetus was a *libertus*. The dancer and barber will have been slaves or freedmen in the household of Domitia Lepida.

7. Cf. Susan Treggiari, "Jobs for Women," *American Journal of Ancient History* 1 (1976):87: "Child care was mostly in the hands of women." For the general practice, see K.R. Bradley, "Wetnursing at Rome: A Study in Social Relations," in B. Rawson, ed., *The Roman Family* (forthcoming).

II

As the case of Nero's boyhood attendants illustrates, Roman literary sources can reveal the names of various male child-minders. Yet when such men as Sosibius, the *educator* of Britannicus, or Sphaerus, the pedagogue of Augustus, are encountered, the evidence tends to be skewed toward people in the service of the imperial family or other upper-class families.⁸ Therefore, a potentially more illuminating guide to the range of families within society which used child-minders can be found in inscriptional evidence, particularly in tombstones, since such material is by nature less partial than the literary record. The lists of *nutritores*, *educatores* and *paedagogi* which follow have been compiled from the inscriptions of Rome in *CIL* VI, and the individual child-minders there on record have been arranged in various categories to reveal both the upper- and lower-class contexts in which they operated. Because the epitaphs frequently provide little information beyond identities and attachments the inscriptional evidence is of limited value. But it is all the same an important body of information which needs to be set out in considerable detail.⁹

A. First, there are four men in the service of children of the imperial family:

1. [L. Aurelius L. Caesaris l. Nicomedes]... divi Veri imp. nutritor	1598
2. Hymnus paedagogus [I]uliae Germanici filiae	3998
3. Malchio Drusi paedagogus	3999
4. M. Livius Augustae lib. Prytanis Liviae Drusi paedag.	33787

The name of Nicomedes (no. 1) comes from a literary source and can safely be restored to the acephalous inscription giving the cursus of the *nutritor* of the emperor Verus. He was given equestrian rank by the emperor Antoninus Pius and went on to hold administrative

8. For Sosibius and Sphaerus, see Tac. *Ann.* 11.1; 4; Dio 48.33.1. Note also Euodius, the *educator* of Caracalla; *PIR*² E 117.

9. The numeral provided with each name is the serial number of the inscription in *CIL* VI in which the child-minder's name is preserved. The attested title of each individual is included, sometimes in parentheses if it does not form part of the man's nomenclature. I have included *nutricii* with *nutritores* in the lists, since the terms are indistinguishable, and in the discussion which follows I have used the terms "nursling" and "charge" for the child supervised by the child-minder, even if the child was an adult by the time a particular inscription was set up. Most of the inscriptions date from the early imperial period.

and military appointments. Such advancement from probable slavery was spectacular and, as with Beryllus and Anicetus above, is attributable to special imperial favour. Eventually, Nicomedes was buried with his wife, Ceionia Laena, whose *nomen* was obviously derived from Verus' family and who thus may have been an imperial freed-woman.¹⁰

The status of M. Livius Prytanis (no. 4) as a *libertus* is certain, and he was presumably manumitted some time before A.D. 14, when Livia became Julia Augusta, but was commemorated after that date. Since their inscriptions come from the Monumentum Liviae, Hymnus (no. 2) and Malchio (no. 3) should be considered at least to be of servile origin. Their single names could indicate actual servile status, though this criterion is not always a reliable guide, and Malchio is distinguished on his inscription from a *liberta*, perhaps his wife,¹¹ which could be taken to suggest that he was indeed a slave.

The children associated with the four men are as follows: first, Lucius Verus, the son of L. Aelius Caesar and (perhaps) Avidia, a shadowy figure, who in A.D. 138 was adopted, at the age of seven and on his father's death, by Antoninus Pius. Second, Julia Livilla, the last child of Germanicus and the elder Agrippina, who was born at Lesbos in A.D. 18, lost her father in infancy (Germanicus died in 19) and her mother in 33, when she will have been fifteen. Drusus, thirdly, may be Drusus Caesar (13 B.C. - A.D. 23), the son of Tiberius and Vipsania, or Drusus Caesar, the son of Germanicus and the elder Agrippina; there seems to be no way of firmly distinguishing between the possibilities, but finally, Livia Julia (died A.D. 31), was the daughter of Nero Claudius Drusus and Antonia Minor (and granddaughter of Livia); her father died in 9 B.C., but her mother outlived her, surviving till A.D. 37.¹²

10. On Nicomedes, see H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le haut-empire romain* (Paris, 1960-1961), no. 163; Anthony Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* (London, 1966), pp. 115, 167; P.R.C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris: A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 27, 237, 265, 283; Gérard Boulvert, *Domestique et fonctionnaire sous le haut-empire romain: la condition de l'affranchi du prince* (Paris, 1974), pp. 65 nn. 384, 385, 126 n. 74, 156 n. 285, 253-255, 265 (his wife), 326; cf. T.D. Barnes, "Hadrian and Lucius Verus," *Journal of Roman Studies* 57 (1967):68. The literary text is *HA Ver.* 2.9, "educatorem habuit Nicomedem".

11. Susan Treggiari, "Jobs in the Household of Livia," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 43 (1975):56.

12. For Verus, see *PIR*² C 606; Birley, *Marcus Aurelius*, pp. 53, 115; R. Syme, *Roman Papers I* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 325-332. For Julia Livilla, see *PIR*² I 674; her *nutrix* and *medica* are also on record, *CIL* VI 8711. For the Drusi, see *PIR*² I 219; I 220. For Livia Julia, see *PIR*² L 303. Cf. Treggiari, "Jobs in the Household of Livia," p. 56, who believes that Hymnus, Malchio and Prytanis were all provided by Livia

B. Next, the following men worked, certainly or possibly, in the service of children of upper-class families:

5. Pao lib. nutritor	1332 (= 31632)
6. Fufidius Amycus (nutritor)	1365
7. Cursius Satrius nutritor	1746
8. Cn. Cornelius Atimetus Cn. Lentuli. Gaetulic. l. (nutricius)	9834
9. [He]rculanius (nutritor)	31686 (= 37055)
10. L. Fabius Ammianus (nutritor)	37078
11. C. Mussius Chrysonicus (nutritor lactaneus)	1424
	1623
	21334
12. Gemellus Messalinae Tauri f. paedagogus	6327
13. Iassulus Philerotis lib. Sisennae paedagogus	6328
14. Philocalus paedagogus	6329
15. T. Statilius Zabda paedag. Statiliae	6330
16. Soterichus paedagog.	9752
17. C. Sulpicius C. l. Venustus (paedagogus)	9754

Three of the *nutritores* in this category are fairly straightforward cases. Pao (no. 5) appears in his inscription without *nomen* (he may thus have been set free by his nursling or his nursling's father, unless he was an independent *nutritor* who was hired), but his status as a freedman is clear enough. Fufidius Amycus (no. 6) seems to be a family *libertus*: he shares his *nomen*, that of his nursling's mother, Fufidia Pollitta, with his companion and probable wife, Fufidia Chrestina, a convention which can be taken to signify former servile status in the same household for both partners.¹³ Cn. Cornelius Atimetus (no. 8), another family *libertus*, was set free by the father of his charge, Cn. Lentulus Gaetulicus, cos. A.D. 26.¹⁴ The remaining *nutritores*, however, present some problems. [He]rculanius (no. 9), for example, might be assumed to be servile on account of his single name, but he was commemorated thus, "nutri[tori clien]nti (*sic*) opsequentissimo", and *cliens* might connote freed, or even free-born status. L. Fabius Ammianus (no. 10) made a dedication to his charge, together with his wife Claudia Dia and their children. Neither spouse carries the *nomen* of the nursling, so they can only be described as free; but if originally servile, one of the pair might have taken the *nomen* of the nursling's mother, who is unfortunately unknown.

herself.

13. Susan Treggiari, "Contubernales in CIL 6" *Phoenix* 35 (1981):56.

14. On whom see *PIR*² C 1390.

Equally uncertain is the status of Cursius Satrius (no. 7), who made a dedication to his charge, calling him "patronus omnia praestantissimus", a phrase which could suggest freed status for the *nutritor*. But in another inscription (*CIL* VI 1745), Cursius Satrius used the same phrase of his nursling's father. Even if it were assumed that the nursling became patron of a man manumitted by his father, a problem would still persist, for the *nutritor's nomen* is different from that of father and son; again, however, freedom could have come from the nursling's mother, who is also unknown. Finally, the *nomina* of Mussius Chrysonicus (no. 11) and his companion Aurelia Soteris similarly differ from the *nomina* of all three of their attested nurslings; the couple may have been a free husband and wife team, working independently, but this view is no more than speculative.

The first four pedagogues (nos. 12-15) in this category are known from inscriptions belonging to the Monumentum Statiliorum, so it can be assumed that they were all originally slaves: indeed, freed status for Iassulus (no. 13) is certain (he must once have been a *vicarius*), and likely for T. Statilius Zabda (no. 15), while the single names of the other two pedagogues point to actual servile status.¹⁵ In the three remaining cases, Soterichus (no. 16) may also have been a slave, but C. Sulpicius Venustus (no. 17), and the Sulpicia Ammia who apparently worked with him and was perhaps his wife was clearly freed.

The children in the charge of these *nutritores* and *paedagogi* were all of senatorial or equestrian status. The senator T. Aelius T. f. Pal. Naevius Severus c.v., who belongs perhaps to the early third century, was commemorated by Pao (no. 5); C. Caerellius Fufidius Annius Ravus C. fil. Ouf. Pollittianus, commemorated by Fufidius Amycus (no. 6; and Fufidia Chrestina), was probably the son of C. Caerellius Sabinus and Fufidia Pollita, daughter of L. Fufidius Pollio, cos. A.D. 166; and the nursling of Cn. Cornelius Atimetus (no. 8) was Cossus Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, son of Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Gaetulicus, cos. A.D. 26.¹⁶ Of Antonius Arrianus, "c(larissimus) i(uvenis)", who made a dedication to [He]rculanius (no. 9), nothing further is known, but L. Virius Lupus Iulianus, who received a dedication from L. Fabius Ammianus (no. 10), was the consul of A.D. 232, and Naeratus Scopius, the charge of Cursius Satrius (no. 7), was a son of Naeratus Cerialis, cos. A.D. 358.¹⁷ The three nurslings

15. Reinier Boulogne, *De Plaats van de Paedagogus in de romeinse Cultuur* (Groningen, 1951), p. 65 identifies Gemellus as Roman, Philocalus as Greek.

16. See *RE* I, 1 col. 525; *PIR*² C 157; C 161; F 507; C 1392; C 1390.

17. See *PIR*² A 814; *RE* IX A, 1 col. 238; Anthony R. Birley, *The Fasti of Roman Britain* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 150-151; *PLRE* I 810.

of Mussius Chrysonicus (no. 11) and of his companion Aurelia Soteris, were Gellia Agrippiana, "c(larissima) p(uella)", Licinia Q. f. Lampetia Basilioflora and her probable brother, Q. Licinius Q. f. Florus Octavianus, eq(ues) Rom(anus).¹⁸

It has been suggested that the pedagogues Gemellus (no. 12) and T. Statilius Zabda (no. 15) both cared for the same child, Statilia Messalina, who in A.D. 66 became the wife of Nero, whereas Iassulus (no. 13) is likely to have cared for Sisenna Statilius Taurus, son of Sisenna Statilius Taurus, cos. A.D. 16.¹⁹ But no specific Statilian child is associated with Philocalus (no. 14). Soterichus (no. 16) was responsible for a relatively fulsome dedication to M. Iunius M. f. Pal. Rufus, who may be the man who was prefect of Egypt from 94 to 98 or the prefect's possible son, or adoptive son, M. Iunius Mettius Rufus, cos. A.D. 128.²⁰ But the connection cannot be certain, and doubt also surrounds the identities of the two apparent sisters, Sulpiciae Galbillae, who set up the dedication to C. Sulpicius Venustus (no. 17), and Sulpicia Amma; they may, however, have been the daughters of C. Sulpicius Galba, cos. A.D. 22.²¹

C. The third category of child-minders represents a complete break with the first two, and introduces men associated with children who were of servile origin:

18. Ti. Claudius Epaphas nutricius	5405
19. Aurelius Glycon nutritor	8425
20. Thamyrus nutricius	8486
21. Ti. Claudius Symmachus Aug. lib. (nutricius)	8660
22. Cointus Aug. lib. (nutritor)	8925
23. C. Tadienus L. f. Secundus nutricius	10170
24. Florentius nutritor	13151
25. Sutius (nutritor)	11005
26. T. Aelius Artemidorus nutritor	16446
27. Eunus nutricius	27365
28. Synhetus nutritor	38952
29. Aurelius Augg. lib. Secundus (educator)	13221
30. Artemisius paedagogus et lib.	8613
31. Carus (regis paedagogus)	8980
32. Q. Lollius Philargurus paedagogus	8989

18. See *PIR*² G 137.

19. See Treggiari, "Jobs for Women," p. 89, suggesting also that the *paedagoga* Statilia Tyrannis (*CIL* VI 6331) served Statilia Messalina. Support is available from Nero's example of a child being attended by a plurality of pedagogues, but other possibilities remain open: see *RE* III A, 2 cols. 2207-2208. For Iassulus' charge see *RE* III A, 2 col. 2199.

20. See *PIR*² I 812; I 374; *RE* Suppl. VII col. 313; P.A. Brunt, "The Administrators of Roman Egypt," *Journal of Roman Studies* 65 (1975):144.

21. See *RE* IV A, col. 758; Treggiari, "Jobs for Women," p. 90.

A number of these men were imperial *liberti*. There is no doubt about Ti. Claudius Symmachus (no. 21) or Cointus (no. 22), Aurelius Secundus (no. 29) or Artemisius (no. 30), while Ti. Claudius Epaphas (no. 18) and Aurelius Glycon (no. 19) are associated with imperial slave nurslings and should themselves be considered imperial freedmen. Moreover, Thamyrus (no. 20) was probably an imperial slave, to judge from his single name and the post attested for him of *dispensator*, and Florentius (no. 24) and C. Tadienus L.f. Secundus (no. 23) also have connections with the *familia Caesaris*. Florentius, who appears in his inscription with only a single name, in contrast to the other individuals mentioned, may well be a slave, but C. Tadienus Secundus was free born—the only certain free-born child attendant in the whole collection. The term “*regis paedagogus*” should probably mean that Carus (no. 31) was an imperial slave.²² Of the others, Sutius (no. 25) and Synhetus (no. 28) both seem to be slaves, to judge from their single names, but Eunus (no. 27) was the *collibertus* of Ti. Claudius Panoptes, who may have been an imperial *libertus*, though his inscription does not say so. T. Aelius Artemidorus (no. 26) was free, as too the pedagogue Q. Lollius Philargurus (no. 32); freed status may be suspected, but cannot be proved.²³

It is important to emphasize that the tending of upper-class children is no longer in evidence here, but of children from the opposite end of the social scale, and as would be expected from what has been seen so far some of the children associated with the child-minders in this category belonged to the *familia Caesaris*. Ti. Claudius Epaphas (no. 18) was commemorated by two slaves who belonged to Domitian, Euhodus and Ev(a)nder, and Q. Lollius Philargurus (no. 32) was commemorated by Evenus Ti. Caesaris Augusti et Iuliae Augustae servos (it is not clear why the pedagogue of a slave belonging to Tiberius and Livia should bear a non-imperial *nomen*, unless he was hired by them). Epictetus, the nursling of Ti. Claudius Symmachus (no. 21), was perhaps an imperial slave too. There are seven cases of nurslings who became imperial *liberti*. A dedication to the senior freedman official M. Aurelius Aug. lib.

22. On these men, see Boulvert, *Domestique et fonctionnaire*, pp. 82 n. 470, 114, 280 n. 114, 326 n. 331, 330. For the second century date of Glycon's inscription, see Weaver, *Familia Caesaris*, pp. 253, 256; and for the servile status of the *Augusti dispensator*, pp. 104, 250; the post is attested for Thamyrus by *CIL* III 563; 12289.

23. Q. Lollius Philargurus may possibly be connected with the QQ. Lollii known from *Cic. Verr.* 3.61-64; cf. *RE* XIII, 2 cols. 1387-1388; or with M. Lollius, cos. A.D. 21; cf. *PIR*² L 311. Treggiari, “Jobs in the Household of Livia,” p. 56 regards him as a freedman.

Isidorus melloproximus a rationibus was made by three people, including his *nutritor*, Aurelius Glycon (no. 19). The nursling of Cointus (no. 22) was Alexander Aug. lib., that of Florentius (no. 24) was M. Aurelius Aug. lib. Marcianus, who died in his fifth year, that of C. Tadienus Secundus (no. 23) was Trophimus Aug. l., a gladiator, and that of Aurelius Secundus (no. 29) was Sabinus Augg. lib. The pedagogue Artemisius (no. 30) set up a dedication to the "puer rarissimus," Faustus Aug. lib. adiutor ab epistulis, who died at the age of nineteen, by which time he had been set free and had also provided for the manumission of Artemisius. Finally, Carus (no. 31) set up a dedication to his *alumnus*, C. Iulius Epaphra divi Augusti l., who died at the age of sixty.²⁴

Some of these cases are of special interest, however, because the relevant inscriptions also reveal the names of the children's parents. For example, M. Aurelius Marcianus was survived not only by his *nutritor* Florentius (no. 24), but also by both parents, M. Aur. Aug. lib. Eutyches and Valeria Eutychia, who might be expected to have been able to take care of their own child.²⁵ The parents of Hymenaeus Thamyrianus, an imperial slave and the charge of Thamyrys (no. 20) are also on record.²⁶ Moreover, the same is true of some of the servile children not associated with the *familia Caesaris*. The *collibertus* of the *nutricius* Eunus (no. 27) was Ti. Claudius Panoptes, who, with his wife Charmosyne, had two daughters, Thetis and Charis, who died at the respective ages of nine and fifteen; supervision by a former slave of children born to parents of servile origin in the same *familia* is indicated, and since the parents survived their children, and indeed Eunus, they too must have been technically available to care for them. Likewise in the case of the apparent slave child Hylocharis Aemilianus: he was commemorated by his parents, Secundus and Successa, and by the *nutritores* Sutius (no. 24) and Sutia, all of whom seem slaves (the parents commented in their inscription that their son's charm had provided consolation in their toil). Clearly there had been no loss of contact between parents and child, despite the appearance in the boy's life of *nutri-*

24. See Boulvert, *Domestique et fonctionnaire*, pp. 280 n. 114, 326 n. 330. Faustus had been set free at a relatively early age; cf. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris*, pp. 69, 101, 103 n. 1, 238, 262; his inscription is not earlier than the era of Hadrian. Boulogne, *Paedagogus*, p. 65 considers Artemisius Greek.

25. See Weaver, *Familia Caesaris*, pp. 101 n. 2, 157-169 for the nomenclature problems of this family group and their resolution through recourse to the sc. *Claudianum*.

26. The parents' names were Herma and Sympherusa; the family group is also known from *CIL* III 563; 12289; cf. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris*, p. 217.

tores. But parents are not always on record. The nursling of T. Aelius Artemidorus (no. 26) was Cornelia Primitiva. She must have been a *liberta* because she described the Cornelia Romana—to whom, together with Artemidorus, she dedicated—her *patrona* (but not her mother). As the owner of the slave girl Primitiva, Cornelia Romana seems to have provided an attendant for the child, as necessary. Finally, Synhetus (no. 28), described in his inscription as the “nutritor Pardi liberti et alumni sui,” received a dedication from two men, Iulius Florentius and Iulius Flosculus. Pardus may have been a foundling set free by the two Iulii, who used another of their slaves to raise the child.

D. Despite many uncertainties, the social status of the children associated with child-minders, whether upper or lower class, has been fairly easy to establish up to this point. There remains, however, a greater number of cases where problems of status attribution are more complicated. In order to avoid a mass of details which lead to few uncontroversial results, most of these cases are best consigned to an appendix for the sake of reference; but a select number of examples is worth direct consideration, to show the difficulties generally characteristic of the remaining evidence.

33. M. Aberrinus Philadespotus (nutricius)	10450
34. Licinius Meropymus liber. (nutritor)	21279
35. Tettienus Perilemptus lib. (nutricius)	27298
36. M. Ul(p)ius Primigenius (nutricius)	29191
37. C. Iulius Hymetus (paedagogus)	2210
38. Diadumenus l. (paedagogus)	9747
39. L. Laevius Nicepo[r] Laeviaes l. (paedagogus)	9749

First, the freed status of L. Laevius Nicepo[r] (no. 39) is clear enough, but whose freedman and pedagogue was he? He may have been connected with an upper-class family: the suffect consul of A.D. 102, L. Antonius Albus, apparent grandson of the M. Antonius Albus known to have been priest of Artemis at Ephesus, was married to a certain Laevia Paula, and so the pedagogue could be associated with this woman's family. But nothing more than the possibility can be stated.²⁷ Secondly, inclusion of filiation in Roman nomenclature will normally signify free-born status, and so free-born children appear in connection with some of the men listed here. But they are not persons of identifiable upper-class families. The servile origin of the pedagogue Diadumenus (no. 38) is certain, but of the Iulia L.f.

27. See *PIR*² L 74; Syme, *Roman Papers I*, p. 92 n. 16; R. Syme, *Roman Papers III* (Oxford, 1984), p. 1075.

Lucilla with whom he is associated nothing is known. Nor is anything known of the Claudia Ti. f. Quinta who set up a rather elaborate inscription to the pedagogue C. Iulius Hymetus (no. 37): the latter had a brother, C. Iulius Epitynchanus, and was Claudia Quinta's "tutor a pupillatu" as well as her pedagogue. Freed status for Hymetus seems likely (but is not provable), though Claudia Quinta herself remains a mystery.²⁸

By contrast, thirdly, servile origins seem likely for children in some cases, though certainty is again elusive. Thus, for example, the free M. Ulpius Felicissimus received a dedication when he died at the age of four from four people, M. Ul(p)ius Primigenius (no. 36) and Capriola, *nutricii*, and M. Ulpius Aug. lib. Merop(s) and Flavia Phoebas, who look very much like the boy's parents but are not called such specifically. Felicissimus could have been the free-born son of Merops, born after the latter's manumission, or his freed son, or a freed slave or *ingenuus* bearing no natural relationship to Merops and Phoebas.²⁹ Similarly, the *libertus et nutricius* Tettienus Perilemptus (no. 35) was commemorated by a woman named Tettiena Livilla, who can be connected with the family which produced consuls in A.D. 80 and c. 99/100 and thus regarded as either a family freedwoman or of freed descent.³⁰ M. Aberrinus Philadespotus (no. 33) received a memorial from his patrons M. Aberrinus Fortunatus and Aemilia Peiagia, for whose daughter he was *nutricius*. He must have been a *libertus*, but the precise status of the patrons, and hence of their daughter, is unknown: they could have been freed, or the free-born descendants of former slaves. Again, Licinius Meropymus (no. 34) was a freedman who acted as *nutritor* to the sons and *alumni* of Licinia Veneria; presumably Veneria manumitted Meropymus, but her exact status cannot be determined: she too could have been a freedwoman or a free-born descendant of former slaves, and so the position of her sons is incalculable. Thus in cases where the children associated with child-minders cannot safely be identified as the children of upper-class families, there may well be more evidence concealed in the inscriptions for the supervision of slave children. Alternatively, if children

28. *PIR*² I 675 is an entry for a third century Iulia Lucilla, but it seems unlikely that she is the same person. Hymetus, considered Greek by Boulogne, *Paedagogus*, p. 65, is further described on his inscription as "aedituus Dianae Plancianae." The name of Claudia Quinta's *mamma*, Iulia Sporis, is also recorded.

29. Boulvert, *Domestique et fonctionnaire*, p. 326 n. 30, regards M. Ulpius Primigenius as an imperial freedman, but this cannot be certain.

30. For the consuls T. Tettienus Severus and Galeo Tettienus Severus Ti. Caepio Hispo, see *RE* V A, 1 col. 1106; Syme, *Roman Papers II*, pp. 708-709.

are considered or prove to be free born, it becomes necessary to postulate use of child-minders for the children of free but modest family background, a kind of "intermediate" social group set off from both upper-class families and those still in or close to slavery.

This last possibility also arises from another group of inscriptions which, although inevitably full of awkward details, seems generally consistent in its main features with the observations made so far. Twenty-one men are attested in the role of *tata*, and they are listed in the final section of the Appendix. They too must be regarded as child-minders, in spite of the fact that the term *tata* can be used to signify a child's real father or a foster-father, because their inscriptions contain the names of the true fathers, and sometimes mothers, of the children with whom they are associated. Essentially the word *tata* is not a functional term, like *nutritor*, *educator*, and *paedagogus*, but a familiar term which connotes no more than an affective bond between a man and a child; obviously therefore the full body of inscriptions which disclose the identities of *tatae* cannot be drawn on for present purposes, since it is often impossible to decide whether an individual *tata* is a father, foster-father, or something else. But in the twenty-one examples cited, it is certain that contacts between the children and their real fathers were not lost, at least in most cases, so it is unlikely that the children on record were *expositi* raised by independent fosterers. Rather, it is preferable to think in terms of a dependent relationship between the *tata* and the child's parents or, in the cases of slave children, between the *tata* and a slave owner.

Positive status is available for only two of the *tatae*: C. Apisius C. l. Felix (no. 83) must have been a *libertus* or *collibertus* of his nursling's father, while Anthus (no. 95) was a slave who probably belonged to the owners of his nursling's father. As elsewhere, servile status is possible for *tatae* who have only one name, but *tatae* whose *nomina* differ from those of parents may well be men hired by free parents with sufficient means to employ personal servants.³¹ None of the children in this category are of demonstrable upper-class background, though two are *ingenui*, the respective nurslings of C. Apisius Felix (no. 83) and Phoebus (no. 86), and instead most seem to be of servile status. To some degree, therefore, this material seems to indicate provision of supervision for children by people at an "intermediate" social level.

31. See Appendix nos. 78, 81, 85, 89, 90, 94, 96 for instances of *tatae* with different *nomina* from those of parents. Susan Treggiari suggests (correspondence of 15 May 1985) that perhaps *tatae* were also "family friends who became quasi-parental as it were by accident—i.e., not paid, but people who grew into the role."

III

If the inscriptional evidence is often scrappy and imprecise, it allows for certain clear facts to emerge nonetheless. First, the epigraphic material shows without doubt that child-minding by men of servile background was a far from uncommon phenomenon at Rome. Of the attested individual *nutritores*, *educatores*, and *paedagogi*, only one can be seen not to have possible or certain servile or freed status, although the possibility must remain open that a free, and perhaps free born, man such as the pedagogue Q. Lollius Philargurus (no. 32) was hired to work, and did not remain in the *familia* to which he had belonged if once a slave. It must be allowed that within the juridical categories of slave and free there is likely to have been a great deal of variation in social status among the child-minders, who should not be viewed as one homogeneous group. Slaves and freedmen who belonged to the *familia Caesaris*, for example, will have thought of themselves as socially superior to, say, men such as Crescentis (no. 46) or Hilarius (no. 70), but this does not affect the basic pattern as a whole.³² Secondly, the inscriptions provide strong evidence of the range within society across which male child-minders were used, not only, that is to say, for children of the imperial family and other upper-class families, but also for children, and especially slave children, of lower-class status. Moreover, child-minders were put in charge of both boys and girls. The literary evidence tends mainly to refer to boys in the care of men, though occasional items refer to girls as well: Cicero has a record of Pilia's pedagogue, for example, and Pliny speaks of the pedagogues of Minicia Marcella.³³ The inscriptions, however, reveal a firm ratio of about one girl to every two boys attended by a child-minder.³⁴ It should not follow that parents at all social levels constantly used child-minders for all of their children, but it is clear that use of child-minders was not a practice confined to the upper levels of society, as the literary evidence might seem at first to suggest, and this is a point that requires emphasis. Thirdly, it appears from various commemorative texts that the tie formed between child-

32. For the latitude which must be allowed in determining social status, see John Putnam Demos, *Entertaining Satan: Witchcraft and the Culture of Early New England* (New York, 1982), pp. 228-233, 288-291; Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven, 1983), pp. 20-23.

33. Cic. *Att.* 12.33.2; Plin. *Ep.* 5.16.3.

34. In the total of ninety-seven cases recorded, thirty-two girls appear and at least sixty-two boys. The number of boys cannot be given accurately, since some inscriptions just refer to an unspecified number of sons.

minder and child lasted at times well beyond the child's attainment of maturity. Artemisius (no. 30), for instance, commemorated the "puer rarissimus" Faustus—the term of endearment is significant—when Faustus died, in his twentieth year, long after he was beyond the practical need of an attendant and when he was himself already at work. The case of Nicephorus (no. 74) is similar. Further, many of the male child-minders on record are definite *liberti* but in view of the uncertainties of status attribution there may be many more, men such as L. Ciartius Hyperes (no. 68) and C. Cestilius Pasiphilus (no. 73).³⁵ What looks like a high rate of manumission for slave child-minders is again suggestive of close personal connections between the men and their charges, or between the men and their charges' parents, and it is well known that imperial legislation on manumission provided for early release from slavery for slave *educatores* and *paedagogi*.³⁶ Perhaps, therefore, *nutritores* similarly benefited. However, close relations between child-minder and child, or parent, cannot be assumed to have been generic: in situations where no tie was formed or endured, commemoration with a tombstone will not have occurred.

IV

The next step must be to try to put these facts into some sort of historical and social context so that the unarguably broad dimensions of male child-minding practices at Rome can be understood. To begin, the functions and conventional images of child-minders can be surveyed, chiefly from the literary evidence, and then some aspects of the experience of childhood itself in Roman society can be outlined, as means of explaining the record already described.

For the *nutritor* and *educator* the literary evidence is less satisfactory than for the *paedagogus*. Indeed, the very meaning of the terms *nutritor* and *educator* is imprecise, and as seen above, *nutritor* and *educator*, and *educator* and *paedagogus* could be used of the same individual in the same job. From Varro's reference to Faustulus as the *nutricius* of Romulus and Remus, and Suetonius' reference to the *nutritor* of the grammarian M. Antonius Gniphio, who, Suetonius says, was exposed at birth by his parents, it is clear that these words

35. Twenty-seven of the first seventy-six men have the element "libertus" in their inscriptions, but only one of the twenty-one *tatae*.

36. Gaius, 1.19; 39 mentions the *paedagogus* only, but *Dig.* 40.2.13 and *Instit.* 1.6.5 add the *educator* (and *nutrix*).

can mean something like foster-father, a man who reared a child in the absence of the child's natural parents.³⁷ However, a passage in the Augustan life of Severus Alexander names a certain Philippus as the boy's *nutritor* in childhood; and although Philippus is probably a fiction, the word *nutritor* here cannot mean the rearer of an orphan, or virtual orphan, since Julia Mamaea, Alexander's mother, was still alive when her son became emperor at the age of twelve or so in A.D. 222, and Gessius Marcianus, his father, survived until about the year 218.³⁸ Moreover, Philippus is spoken of in conjunction with a *nutrix*, Olympias, doubtless a fictitious person too, but nurses are not generically associated with orphaned children. The word *nutritor* should thus be understood to mean primarily the male equivalent of the *nutrix*, and not a foster-father raising a child who had been separated from parents. The inscriptional evidence has already revealed some male child-minders in the service of children whose parents outlived them, and so *nutritor* must be considered for the most part to mean a male nurse, and not to imply that parents were unavailable to rear their own children.³⁹

The term *educator* can also mean either a man who independently reared an exposed child for whom he was a true foster-father, or a man who was a family dependant responsible for early childrearing, someone who can be contrasted with parents and teachers.⁴⁰ As noted above, Tacitus specifically refers to Sosibius and Anicetus as the *educatores* of Britannicus and Nero. The parents of the children

37. Varro, *RR* 2.1.9; Suet. *Gramm.* 7. According to Suetonius, M. Antonius Gniphos was a free-born child later manumitted by his *nutritor*. This implies that Gniphos became a slave after his exposure, though the implication has been denied on technical legal grounds; see Alan Watson, *The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic* (Oxford, 1967), p. 171; Susan Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen During the Late Republic* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 114-115, 248. But in reality the technical situation may have been irrelevant and Gniphos was probably "in statu servitutis" (Suet. *Gramm.* 21). S.L. Mohler, "Slave Education in the Roman Empire," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 71 (1940):265 called the *nutritor* Gniphos's master. See also Johannes Christes, *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen im antiken Rom* (Wiesbaden, 1979), pp. 21-25.

38. *HA Sev. Alex.* 13.4. See Anthony Birley, *Septimius Severus* (London, 1971), p. 297; R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography: Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1971), p. 146.

39. For other usages of *nutritor/nutricius* cf. Caes. *BC* 3.108; *Bell. Alex.* 4; *Dig.* 33.7.27, and see the discussion of Suzanne M. Dixon, "The Roman Mother," Ph.D. Diss., Australian National University, 1985, pp. 319-326.

40. See Cic. *Planc.* 81; Sen. *Controv.* 9.3.2; 9; 10; 14; 10.4.3; 21; Sen. *Ben.* 3.17.4; Quint. 7.1.14; *Decl.* 358; 372; 376; Tac. *Ann.* 15.62; *HA Pius* 10.5. Cf. in general TLL s.v. "educator" and Mima Maxey, *Occupations of the Lower Classes in Roman Society* (Chicago, 1938), pp. 55-56.

associated with the epigraphical *educatores* are all unknown, but it is not likely that the *educatores* themselves were true foster-fathers and in general the word *educator* is best understood as a synonym for *nutritor*, as just defined.⁴¹

The literary sources are not terribly helpful on indicating when a child was entrusted to a *nutritor* or *educator*. Seneca is reported to have called himself Nero's *educator*, but perhaps with some exaggeration since Nero was eleven years old when Seneca became his tutor, yet Britannicus was still surrounded by his *educatores* at the age of fourteen. By contrast, it can be computed that Nicomedes became the *nutritor/educator* of Verus before the boy was eight.⁴² However, in a small way the inscriptional evidence makes up the literary deficiency, because memorials set up to deceased children occasionally include the children's ages at death. Eight ages are in fact available,

TABLE 1
AGE AT DEATH OF NURSLINGS
(NUTRITOR/EDUCATOR INSCRIPTIONS)

Child's Name	Age at Death			Reference
	Y.	M.	D.	
M. Aurelius Aug. lib. Marcianus	4	8	3	13151
M. Licinius Hermes	2	—	38	15104
Geminia Agathe	5	7	22	19007
M. Terentius Paternus	18	—	—	27198
Thetis	9	—	—	27365
Charis	15	—	—	27365
M. Ulpius Felicissimus	4	—	5	29191
Manlia Niceph[oris]	5	—	—	38598

Ages 0 - 4 years: 1 case
Ages 5 - 9 years: 5 cases
Ages 10 - 14 years: 0 cases
Ages 15 - 19 years: 2 cases
Total: 8 cases

as Table 1 indicates. Moreover, if the evidence of the *tatae* inscriptions is included, additional information on children's ages at death becomes available. (See Table 2). The higher ages at death will not signify that the male attendant was still at work when the "child"

41. See *Gloss. Lat.* II "Abavus," *Ed.* 12; cf. Maxey, *Occupations of the Lower Classes*, p. 55.

42. Tac. *Ann.* 15.62; 13.15; cf. 12.8; 14.53. For Verus, see the references in n. 10 above.

TABLE 2
AGE AT DEATH OF NURSLINGS
(TATA INSCRIPTIONS)

Child's Name	Age at Death			Reference
	Y.	M.	D.	
C. Vibius Threptus	14	—	28	2334
Arminia Gorgilla	15	5	6	5642
Stertinia Maxima	3	10	9	6703
Aelius Primus	23	—	—	10873
Aelius Ingenuus	24	—	—	10873
Alexander	—	5	—	11395
Crescentilla	11	6	2	16578
L. Flavius L. f. Anien. Saturninus	5	6	—	18196
Hortensia Iusta	8	—	18	19552
Iusta	16	—	4	20930
C. Numisius Felicissimus	4	—	54	23113
C. Q(uintius) Hermias	4	4	8	25301
Terentia Spe(s)	3	—	—	27259
Victor	2	3	—	28906
T. Aconius Karus	21	3	—	34206
Ti. Iulius [...]	3	—	30	35530
Silvia	3	2	9	36353

Ages 0 - 4 years: 6 cases

Ages 5 - 9 years: 4 cases

Ages 10 - 14 years: 1 case

Ages 15 - 19 years: 3 cases

Ages 20 - 24 years: 3 cases

Total: 17 cases

died, only that an affective bond had been maintained after the nursing's childhood years. But the evidence as a whole establishes male involvement in child supervision for children's earliest years, and so lends credibility to Mussius Chrysonicus' description of himself as *nutritor lactaneus*, an attendant who fed milk to his charges.

The *nutrix*, besides fulfilling her obvious main function, is represented in literature as a comforter figure, telling stories to her nursing, rocking and singing the child to sleep and so on. Yet the male nurse has no comparable conventional portrayal, a situation which could be taken to mean that the male nurse was less prominent a figure in Roman society, and it is certainly the case that more

nutrices appear in the inscriptions of Rome.⁴³ But the work must have been similar—Britannicus' *educatores* were still, it seems, in charge of feeding him as a teenager (Tac. *Ann.* 15.62)—and it is notable that several of the men are associated with women nurses (Mussius Chrysonicus again providing an example), so couples may not infrequently have worked together as teams.⁴⁴ When Soranus (*Gyn.* 2.20) made his recommendations on how to select a wet nurse, he assumed a plurality of women to be available in upper-class households, but perhaps, in actuality, men sometimes assisted the wet nurses with various tasks.

For pedagogues the literary evidence is much clearer. Two functions are evident. First, in a narrow sense, the pedagogue, like the *educator*, was or could be an early teacher for a child and in some discussions it is this educational function which receives most attention.⁴⁵ But, secondly, the pedagogue was also a child-minder, taking over the tasks of supervising the child's daily regimen which previously had been handled by nurses, whether male, female, or both. The appearance of the pedagogue as a figure in Roman society resulted from Rome's contacts with the Greek world in the age of overseas expansion in the third and second centuries B.C., and it is in Plautus' play *Bacchides* that the duties of the pedagogue are first clearly articulated in a Roman context. Admittedly there is always a danger in relying on Plautus for historical evidence given the Greek literary tradition on which his plays depend. But in view of the specifically Roman elements detectable in the plays, there seems little reason to doubt that the portrayal of Lydus in *Bacchides* was not consistent with popular conceptions of the pedagogue at Rome at the turn of the second century B.C. Lydus, called both *paedagogus* and *magister* in the play, is the chaperon of the *adulescens* Pistoclerus, and it is at once of note that he is in attendance on a grown-up child. This is not merely a dramatic convention, for later evidence shows that the pedagogue at times retained supervision of the child well beyond boyhood. Lydus appears to be a slave (*Bacch.* 162) and,

43. On the *nutrix*, see in general Bradley, "Wetnursing at Rome."

44. The following couples are attested: Fufidius Amycus (no. 6) + Fufidia Chrestina; L. Fabius Ammianus (no. 10) + Claudia Dia; Mussius Chrysonicus (no. 11) + Aurelia Soteris; M. Ul(p)ius Primigenius (no. 36) + Capriola; Ti. Cl. Hermes (no. 45) + Cl. Paterna (?); C. Apisius Felix (no. 83) + *nutrix*; Iulius Telesphor (no. 85) + Cornelia S(p)es, *mamma*; P. Farsuleius Isidorus (no. 90) + Quintia Parthenope, *nutrix*; Anthus (no. 95) + Rhoxane, *mamma*; Salonijs Epictetus (no. 96) + Aphrodisia, *mamma*.

45. Thus for example Boulogne, *Paedagogus*; Stanley F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1977), pp. 34-46.

disturbed by what he regards as contemporary moral laxity, finds refuge in his vision of a more salubrious past. In the old days, he says (*Bacch.* 419-434; 438-439), it used to be common for a pedagogue to remain with his charge until the latter was twenty years of age or until he had begun to hold public office, and he obviously believes his presence is still required for Pistoclerus, even though today the pedagogue receives far less respect and deference than in the better times past. His function has been to instil *disciplina* in Pistoclerus, discipline meaning both academic and moral instruction, and now that Pistoclerus is no longer a child, Lydus' job is to fortify the moral lessons of earlier days by continuing to serve as Pistoclerus' moral tutor and chaperon, counteracting current permissiveness as found even in Pistoclerus' father. Due to the nature of the play, it may be that more attention is given to the moralistic than academic aspect of Lydus' occupation; nevertheless, the pedagogue here emerges as something rather more than a simple servant entrusted with a child's earliest academic training: the shaping of a child's character from boyhood to manhood has been and still remains the dominant feature of Lydus' relationship with Pistoclerus.

In later times, Cicero and Quintilian shared the opinion that it mattered to what sorts of pedagogue children listened for the sake of their speech, and Quintilian was prepared to allow that well-educated pedagogues could function as teachers.⁴⁶ But when boys went to school, they were more commonly accompanied, not taught, by their pedagogues, who were expected to exercise *custodia* over their charges, and it is this protective aspect which recurs time and time again in literary anecdotes about and allusions to pedagogues.⁴⁷ Protectiveness could include the teaching of etiquette and decorum. Plutarch (*Moral.* 439F-440A) reports that what the pedagogue taught children was "to walk in the public streets with lowered head; to touch salt-fish with but one finger, but fresh fish, bread and meat with two; to sit in such and such a posture; in such and such a way to wear their cloaks;" and Seneca (*Ep.* 94.8) gave the following as examples of pedagogues' precepts: "Walk thus and so; eat thus and so. This is the proper conduct for a man and that for a woman; this for a married man and that for a bachelor." But beyond the practical level came moral protectiveness, for the pedagogue was to "train the child's character to take a first step, as it were, on the path of

46. Cic. *Brut.* 210-211; Quint. 1.1.11; 1.1.8; but 1.2.10 implies that the pedagogue was not usually concerned with academic instruction.

47. For *custodia*, Quint. 1.1.25; for the pedagogue accompanying the boy to and from school, Cic. *Amicit.* 20.74; Apul. *Met.* 10.5; App. *BC* 4.30.

virtue" (Plut. *Moral.* 439F). Thus he physically guarded the boy against homosexual harassment, and was in constant attendance upon him in public and private.⁴⁸ Hence the witticism recorded by Suetonius (*Galba* 14.2) that T. Vinus, Cornelius Laco, and Icelus were called Galba's pedagogues, because they lived with him in the palace and never left his side. Under these circumstances, it was imperative that the pedagogue be of sound character, that he display *probitas*, and be "of quiet disposition."⁴⁹ Preferably the pedagogue should be a man of some education, or at least aware of his shortcomings, for the influence he could exercise on his charge was profound, a fact of which Seneca, among others, was very much aware and one which points up strongly the question of why Roman upper-class parents were so consistently prepared to entrust their children's formative years to servants of considerably lower social status: "Every young thing attaches itself to what is nearest and grows to be like it: the character of their nurses (*nutrices*) and tutors (*paedagogi*) is presently reproduced in that of the young men."⁵⁰

If the ideal pedagogue was therefore a *bonus vir* (Sen. *Ep.* 25.6), it is clear that the ideal was not always realized. Plutarch (*Moral.* 4A-B) suggests the kinds of problems that might arise: "Nowadays, the common practice of many persons is ridiculous...; any slave whom they find to be a wine-bibber and a glutton, and useless for any kind of business, to him they bring their sons and put them in his charge." The pedagogue, it was thought, might have a harmful effect on the character of his charge. The emperor Claudius, in particular, seems to have had a very low opinion of his pedagogue's character and remembered the man's treatment of him with bitterness (Suet. *Claud.* 2.2). But from the pedagogue's point of view it must be understood that the job of child supervision cannot always have been easy. Punishment was necessary at times, and Plutarch's praise of Sarpedon (*Cato min.* 1.5), the pedagogue of the younger Cato, for avoiding corporal punishment implies that such chastisement was widely practised by pedagogues, while Martial (10.62.10) refers to the *sceptra paedagogorum* with which the beating was presumably done. It is consequently not surprising that the pedagogue could be stereotypically portrayed as stern in appearance, or as a target of children's resentment and displeasure.⁵¹

48. Mart. 9.27.10-11; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 44.2, Augustus assigning special seats at the games for young boys, with adjoining seats for the pedagogues, in a passage emphasizing maintenance of decorum at the *spectacula*.

49. Cic. *Att.* 12.33.2; Sen. *Ira* 2.21.9.

50. Sen. *Ira* 2.21.9; cf. also Sen. *Epp.* 25.5-6; 11.8-9; Plut. *Moral.* 4A-B; *Cato min.* 1.5; Quint. 1.1.8.

Yet despite the complaints of moralists, the literary evidence tends to leave a fond image of the pedagogue, which presumably must be based on ties of intimacy between pedagogue and child formed early in the child's life and maintained over time. The manumission and public funeral of Sphaerus, Augustus' pedagogue, has to be understood in this way. More generally, the pedagogue can be set alongside the nurse and mother as a person devoted to the child's best interests, as one prepared to defend the child against physical attack, as a servant faithful till his master's death; he could be thought of as too indulgent of the child, but his name could never be forgotten.⁵¹ Still, there could be no thought that the affective ties of childhood should lead to the formation in adulthood of a close and equal bond with the pedagogue: "As a rule decisions about friendships should be formed after strength and stability have been reached in mind and age; nor should men who in boyhood were devoted to hunting and games of ball, keep as their intimates those whom they loved at that period simply because they were fond of the same pursuits. For on that principle nurses (*nutrices*) and the slaves who attended us to and from school (*paedagogi*), will, by right of priority of acquaintance, claim the largest share of our goodwill. I admit that they are not to be neglected, but they are to be regarded in an entirely different way; under no other conditions can friendship remain secure." Thus Cicero (*Amicit.* 20.74), whose remarks are noteworthy on several counts: besides illustrating again the potential for a child's intimacy with his pedagogue and the maintenance over time of the close association, they also point up the social distance between child and pedagogue and imply dominance of the pedagogue over the parents in the child's early life. Once more, therefore, the problem is raised of why upper-class Roman parents entrusted the moulding of their children's characters to men whose status made them, in Cicero's view at least, unworthy of equal association once the children reached maturity.

The literary evidence shows beyond doubt that the pedagogue was a fixed element in the life of the upper-class child in Rome of the classical period. From the time when a *nutrix* or *nutritor* was no longer needed, or when extra help was required, the pedagogue was probably the child's most constant companion and focal point of reference through the early years, even as the circle of social contacts expanded to include, besides parents, teachers and fellow

51. Suet. *Nero* 37.1; Dio Chrys. 72.10.

52. Sen. *Epp.* 60.1; 27.5; *Ira* 2.21.6; Val. Max. 1.8.12; App. *BC* 4.30; for Sphaerus, Dio 48.33.1.

pupils. The pedagogue's job was to instil in the child the social graces and to provide rudimentary academic knowledge, but also, and more importantly to guide the child through the advancing years in the capacity of moral custodian. As a child rearer the pedagogue, always of servile status or background it seems, was given responsibilities by the child's parents which they were unable or unwilling to assume themselves, even though he might be a figure against whom a strong social prejudice was felt. In view of the time spent with the child and the tasks he performed, the pedagogue, like the *nutritor* and *educator*, has to be regarded as a surrogate parent, and few upper-class children can have remained immune from the formative influence he exercised upon them. The socialization of the Roman child was therefore heavily dependent upon the person of the pedagogue, as indeed upon that of the *nutritor* and *educator*. For although few details are visible in the literary record on the *nutritor* and *educator*, much of the material on pedagogues just now surveyed should be applied to the *nutritor* and *educator* as well, given the sources' lack of precision on the terminology for child-minders and Plutarch's specific statement that children were given over to the care of pedagogues as soon as their nurses had weaned them.⁵³ Throughout the child's life, from infancy till adulthood, one or a succession of child-minding figures provided a presence whose impact on the child may well have been as great as the influence of parents, and explanation of that presence is clearly needed. What were the factors, then, which prompted the reliance in Roman society on the child-minding figure?

V

Most easily, the use of child-minders by upper-class parents can be regarded as a function of slave owning in a society marked by extremes of wealth, power and status. Wealthy Roman families customarily maintained extensive numbers of slaves and freedmen in their households; hence the use of child-minders from within the slave *familia* will to some degree have been a simple matter of aristocratic convenience. Moreover, the highly specialized jobs of Roman slaves and freedmen make it far from startling that care of children should have been delegated to particular individuals by parents, and perhaps especially by mothers, who did not consider the mundane aspects of child tending consistent with or appropriate to their social

53. Plut. *Moral.* 439F; cf. above n. 36.

dignity. But does the widespread use of male child-minders imply among the Roman elite a general indifference to children on the part of their parents, an attitude perhaps prompted by a relatively high rate of infant mortality and a consequent reluctance to over-invest emotionally in young children whose survival to adulthood was far from predictable? That is an enormous question and one which cannot be fully investigated here. But although frequent losses of young children may well have led to a degree of emotional detachment on the part of parents, sufficient examples of genuine grief expressed by parents on the occasion of premature child death are available to offset any proposition of wholesale parental indifference. Moreover, the hopes invested in Roman children of extending and emulating the traditional accomplishments of their families in public life were considerable, and far more was involved than personal loss when children died. Again, therefore, generic indifference among the Roman upper classes is not to be expected.⁵⁴

As the original example of Nero suggests, there may at times have been a very practical reason for parents' use of child-minders, namely, the sheer unavailability of parents to do the job themselves. Maternal death in childbirth must on occasion have compelled use of a wet nurse if an infant's survival were to be guaranteed, and subsequent progression from a *nutrix* to a *nutritor* to a *paedagogus* is thus explicable in terms of practical necessity. However, the possibility of response to maternal death is only one of a sequence of conditions which can be summoned to suggest that the prospect of stability in the life of the growing Roman child was in no way an inherent element of childhood. Familiar details from the history of the Julio-Claudians can serve to illustrate the situation.

The pursuit of a public career at Rome necessitated at times that a man leave the city for military or administrative service abroad. In consequence, contact between father and children might be not only temporarily broken but completely ruptured. Augustus was only four years old when his father C. Octavius died at Nola, late in 59 B.C. or

54. On the specialization of slave jobs, see Treggiari, "Jobs in the Household of Livia," and "Jobs for Women." For expressions of grief in response to child death, see Keith Hopkins, *Death and Renewal: Sociological Studies in Roman History* 2 (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 218-226; cf. Bradley, "Wetnursing at Rome." For the difficulties involved in determining parental attitudes in general, see Linda A. Pollock, *Forgotten Children: Parent-Child Relations from 1500 to 1900* (Cambridge, 1983); cf. Stephen Wilson, "The Myth of Motherhood a Myth: The Historical View of European Child-Rearing," *Social History* 9 (1984):181-198. For child-minding in later periods see, for example, Eugene D. Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York, 1972), pp. 506-509; George D. Sussman, *Selling Mothers' Milk: The Wet-Nursing Business in France 1715-1914* (Urbana, 1982).

early in 58, as he returned from the governorship of Macedonia, while Claudius can scarcely have known his father Drusus at all, for he was only one in 9 B.C. when Drusus died on campaign against the Germans. Caligula was seven when his father Germanicus died, prematurely, on 10 October A.D. 19 in Syria, though in this case the child had accompanied the father on his eastern mission. But all the Julio-Claudian emperors in fact lost their fathers while they themselves were children.⁵⁵

In such circumstances the way was open for the child to form a new relationship with a stepparent once the surviving parent remarried. Thus the young Augustus spent part of his childhood in the household of L. Marcius Philippus, whom Atia, Augustus' mother, married after the death of C. Octavius (Dio 45.1.1). As the case of Nero illustrates once more, a new father figure might make only a relatively brief appearance in a child's life, but in view of the high incidence of divorce and remarriage among the Roman aristocracy of the late Republic and early Empire, the intrusion of a stepparent into a young child's life was a very common event. Tiberius was only nine when his father died, but he had known a stepfather since the age of three in the person of Augustus, whom his mother Livia Drusilla married in 38 B.C. after her divorce from Ti. Claudius Nero. Similarly, Julia, the daughter of Augustus by his second wife Scribonia, was born on the very day of her parents' divorce in 39 B.C. and will have known Livia as her stepmother from earliest memory.⁵⁶

Julio-Claudian history, indeed, is replete with examples of events which may be imagined to have made an impact upon the emotional development of the family's children. Augustus' grandsons, C. and L. Caesar, were respectively aged eight and five when their father, M. Agrippa, died in 12 B.C., though in 17 B.C. both had been adopted by, and thus had found a new father in, Augustus himself.⁵⁷ Since Julia, their mother, remarried the year after Agrippa's death, her sons will also have been presented with a *de facto* stepfather in the person of Tiberius, though her third son, Agrippa Postumus, never

55. For Augustus, see Suet. *Aug.* 8.1, with John M. Carter, *Suetonius Divus Augustus* (Bristol, 1982), pp. 92-93, 97-98 (and note also Augustus' *nutricula* at Suet. *Aug.* 94.6); for Claudius see Suet. *Claud.* 2.1; Dio 55.1.4; for Caligula see Tac. *Ann.* 2.72; Suet. *Cal.* 10.1. For the full source material on the Julio-Claudian emperors as children, see *PIR*² I 215; C 941; I 217; C 942; D 129.

56. For Julia, see Dio 48.34.3; for Augustus' marriage to Livia, see Carter, *Divus Augustus*, p. 182. On the frequency of remarriage in Roman society generally, see M. Humbert, *Le remariage à Rome* (Milan, 1972).

57. See *PIR*² I 216; I 222.

actually knew his true father.⁵⁸ It was not until 2 B.C., when Agrippa Postumus will have been ten, that Julia was sent into exile, but he came to regard Livia as his stepmother all the same (Dio 55.32.1). Again, Germanicus was no more than six or so when his father Drusus died, while at the moment of his own death the ages of his surviving children ranged from three to fourteen.⁵⁹ Later, the children of Claudius, Octavia and Britannicus, were still in their teens when their father died in A.D. 54, while the appearance of a stepmother in their lives in A.D. 48 was to prove fateful for both of them.⁶⁰ It is not surprising to learn, therefore, that several of the Julio-Claudian children passed from household to household as fortune affected their parents: Augustus lived for a time in the house of his grandmother Julia when a boy, Caligula in that of Livia and that of his grandmother Antonia, and Nero in that of his aunt Domitia Lepida; Caligula's sisters Drusilla and Livilla were also for a time in the care of Livia and Antonia.⁶¹ What becomes clear, consequently, is that the life of the upper-class Roman child was not uncommonly subject to a series of dislocating circumstances, which rendered minimal the anticipation of a stable domestic environment during the years of childhood itself. The dangers from politics were certainly unpredictable, and the infant Tiberius was perhaps lucky to survive his parents', and his own, flight through Italy, Sicily, and Greece in the troubled years 39-38 B.C. (Suet. *Tib.* 6). But in a society where parents did not necessarily expect to remain married to the same partners indefinitely, it was more predictable that parents might not at all constitute their offspring's essential domestic framework of reference.

Of course, it could be objected that the Julio-Claudians were an exceptional family and that the various vicissitudes confronted by their children were due only to the family's position of political primacy. But the objection can be easily countered. Consider, for example, the case of M. Iunius Brutus, the assassin of Caesar. The son of M. Iunius Brutus and Servilia, he was born in 85 B.C. and lost his father in 77 B.C. After her first husband's death, Servilia provided Brutus with a stepfather when she married D. Iunius Silanus, by whom she had three daughters, all named Iunia. But Brutus was adopted by his mother's brother, Servilius Caepio, and even in antiquity itself the paternity of Brutus was questioned in view

58. See *PIR*² I 634; I 214.

59. See *PIR*² I 221; I 223; I 220; I 641; I 664; I 674.

60. See *PIR*² C 1110; C 820.

61. Nic. Dam. 3; Suet. *Cal.* 10.1; 24.1; for Nero, see above.

of Servilia's notorious association with Caesar. It is difficult to understand how the young Brutus responded to the loss of his father, his adoption, his mother's remarriage and creation of a new family, or to the family of his mother's half-brother and half-sister, M. Porcius Cato and Porcia, though he was himself to marry the daughter, another Porcia, of his mother's half-brother.⁶² The family situation was complex, but by no means unrepresentative of late Republican familial history; and under the Empire the tortuous marital life of senatorial families continued unabated, as Table 3 illustrates for one individual in particular, Vistilia, the mother of Nero's general, Cn.

TABLE 3: VISTILIA'S HUSBANDS AND CHILDREN

VISTILIA born not later than 30 B.C.	Glitius	?Glitius b. c. 15 B.C.
	Pomponius	Q. Pomponius Secundus, cos. 41 A.D. b. c. 14 B.C.
		P. Pomponius Secundus, cos. 44 A.D. b. c. 12 B.C.
	Orfitus	?Orfitus b. c. 11 B.C.
	[Suillius]	Suillius Rufus, cos. 45 A.D.? b. c. 10 B.C.
	Domitius Corbulo	Cn. Domitius Corbulo, cos. 39 A.D. b. c. 4 B.C.
	[Milonius]	Milonia Caesonia b. c. 5 A.D. married Caligula in 40 A.D.

Based on Syme, *Roman Papers* II, pp. 805-814.

Domitius Corbulo. This information is drawn from a reconstruction of Vistilia's personal history and is admittedly hypothetical in part. But it indicates a plausible set of circumstances for Vistilia and thereby helps, to some degree, to emphasize the lack of stability in the upper-class Roman family. Vistilia's seven pregnancies, by six husbands, extended over a period of twenty years, but only two of her children were full siblings. Presumably she created six new households over twenty years, but did she take her children with her

62. On Brutus, see M.L. Clarke, *The Noblest Roman: Marcus Brutus and His Reputation* (London, 1981), pp. 9-12, and the analysis of Thomas W. Africa, "The Mask of an Assassin: A Psychohistorical Study of M. Junius Brutus," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 8 (1977-1978):599-626.

on each successive occasion (on the assumption that all survived, though this is not certain for ?Glitius and ?Orfitus)? What was the relationship between her children and their successive stepfathers? And what were the relationships among the children themselves, if indeed there was opportunity for such?

It is within this context of childhood spent in uncertain, and frequently shifting, parental marital circumstances that the role of child-minders may perhaps best be appreciated. In contrast to the postulate of widespread familial dislocation in Roman children's lives derived from the evidence just described, the evidence on servile child-minders, as noted already, shows that a relationship between the child and his attendant was often close and enduring over time. The information on manumission from the inscriptions, the very acts of commemoration which the inscriptions represent, and the occasional anecdotes surrounding men like Sphaerus, all reveal constant maintenance of affective bonds between children and servants, though again the limitations of the evidence must be guarded against. To some extent, however, it should be possible to imagine that the child-minder provided an emotional and physical stability in the life of the child which was not always present in the parent-child relationship. Moreover, that function was made possible by the existence of the slavery system at Rome, for the men who acted as child attendants can have had little choice about the jobs they performed, given that they were compulsorily appointed to tasks assigned to them by their masters. Servants were not likely to find themselves separated from their charges by the requirements of public careers or new marriages, and the potential for secure personal relationships which might follow in children's lives is reflected not least in Cicero's remarks, quoted earlier, on childhood friendships with servants.

This is not to say that relations between upper-class Roman children and their parents could never be close and affectionate; plainly, such a gross generalization would be absurd. But the obtrusive presence of the child-minders does indicate that views about the nature of the Roman family have to be flexible enough to allow for the incorporation within the family structure of more individuals than simply parents and children. Furthermore, the presence of child-minders in the Roman family heightens understanding of the master-slave relationship at Rome: for as the slavery system expanded through the late Republic and early Empire, the manipulation of slaves to the interests of the elite produced a relationship in which emotional factors offset the disparities of power and status between

slave owner and slave, and led to a dependence of the former on the latter that went far beyond the level of the material and the physical. Upper-class parents, that is to say, used surrogates under their control as a kind of compensatory mechanism for the essential lack of stability in Roman family life (to what degree of consciousness it is of course impossible to say), and to offset the far from remote possibility that they would have to face the loss of children before the latter achieved maturity. That mechanism was made possible by a system of widescale slave-owning which upper-class parents were able to exploit to the full, and which they continued to maintain over time.

Is it possible, finally, to explain why so many child-minders were men? Perhaps the simplest solution lies in the general distinction that can be drawn in Roman society between the seclusive world of women and the more open world of men. The *nutrix* who catered to the upper-class infant will not have been obliged in the normal course of her work to appear beyond the confines of the household to which she belonged. But once children were old enough to dine in public, to attend public ceremonies and to start a proper education, their chaperons and companions were more likely to be men for the reason that men were admitted to a greater degree of public mobility, even if of servile status. The existence of male child-minders at Rome, therefore, was predicated on general assumptions about male and female propriety which were deeply entrenched in the Roman mentality.⁶³

VI

The children of elite families embodied their parents' hopes for continuation of familial success in politics and statecraft, and to that extent upper-class children represented the future of Rome. But the situation was far different for children born into slavery. The achievement of renown, through military accomplishments and tenure of high governmental positions, and the contraction of spectacular marriage alliances were objects of ambition closed off by definition to the offspring of servile parents. Instead, and more modestly, slave children could aspire to the award of manumission, in return for faithful service, and the maintenance of a livelihood through skills acquired early in life. Yet the inscriptional evidence

63. On Roman women in general, see Sarah B. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves* (New York, 1975).

shows beyond doubt that it was not at all uncommon for slave children to be provided with child-minders, so again the creation of a social context is required in order to account for that observable reality. What, therefore, are the relevant factors?

As with upper-class children, maternal death in childbirth may in some cases have made the use of the child-minder unavoidable if an infant were to survive. As seen above, the parents of slave children are often unknown, and while a variety of factors could explain that fact, early maternal death must be considered one of them. In addition, children raised in slavery may have started their lives, like M. Antonius Gniphio, as exposed infants who were taken up and raised as the *alumni* of people sufficiently prosperous to provide for them, and the *alumni* of the Licinia Veneria associated with Licinius Meropymus (no. 34) perhaps fall into such a category. Further, slave children may have been separated from their parents not by exposure, but by the sale of their parents or themselves away from the *familia* into which they had been born. Evidence for the fragility of slave family life at Rome is unambiguous, and indeed disruption of slave families could and did occur not only as a result of sale but through bequests or gifts of individual slaves as well. No slave owner was obliged to respect the familial relationships which his slaves had formed among themselves.⁶⁴

Within such reasoning, however, it is implicit that slave children were considered worth rearing, and it has been seen in the inscriptional evidence that contacts between children and parents were not always lost despite the presence of surrogates. The provision of child-minders for slave children by slave owners is best explained, therefore, by emphasizing the economic value of the children, and, in cases where children and parents had not been separated, by slave owners' wishes to ensure that slave or ex-slave parents were not unduly diverted from their normal occupations by the requirements of tending their children. Sentiment does not have to be regarded a factor of general relevance. The occasional slave owner may have believed that a *nutritor* or *paedagogus* was important for the emotional development of a slave child separated from parents, but the protection of property in his ownership will have been a more paramount concern. With the advent of the imperial age, and a corresponding decrease in the numbers of slaves available from wars

64. For the background of slave family life, see K.R. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: A Study in Social Control* (Brussels, 1984), pp. 47-80. On *alumni*, see now B. Rawson, "Children in the Roman *Familia*" in B. Rawson, ed., *The Roman Family* (forthcoming).

of conquest, the rearing of slave children to adulthood became an important means at Rome of maintaining the level of the servile population. Slave owners provided female nurses for slave infants in their *familiae*, and again therefore progression to the *nutritor* and *paedagogus* marked a logical step. Although the material dependence of the politically and socially elite upon continuing supplies of slaves from one generation to the next is self-evident, a clear demonstration of how young slaves were prepared for their adult roles is provided by the institution of the *paedagogium Caesaris*, reconstruction of the epigraphical evidence on which suggests that imperial slaves, as boys, were trained by special pedagogues for court service and other duties in later life. Yet what is visible on a relatively large scale in the imperial household was probably only a development of a principle in evidence in all elite households: the younger Pliny maintained a *paedagogium* in one of his villas at least, which quartered young slaves in his possession, and he is not likely to have been exceptional.⁶⁵

It remains to consider briefly the use of child attendants in what has been termed an "intermediate" social level, that is, among people who seem to be free from slavery but not from the upper levels of Roman society. The families of Iulia Lucilla and Claudia Quinta come into play here, women known from the inscriptions of Diadumenus (no. 38) and C. Iulius Hymetus (no. 37), but there are other kinds of complexity. For instance, a certain P. Aelius Placentius set up a dedication to his sons' *nutritor*, M. Aurelius Liberalis (no. 41). Both men are free, but whether freed or free born it is impossible to tell. Their *nomina* suggest connections with the *familia Caesaris*, but that is only a possibility. However, Liberalis is not likely to have been the *libertus* of Placentius, given their different *nomina* (unless on the unknown wife's side), but he could have been a hired man. If the free(d) father employed a free(d) *nutritor* for his sons, it would seem nevertheless that the child attendant was used by a family not far removed from slavery. Perhaps the most that can be said of examples such as these is that parents' transition from slavery to freedom left them with some child-minding resources from within the *familia* where they had once been slaves, or, in the case of truly free-born parents and children, that upper-class conventions were followed by people lower on the social scale,

65. On *nutrices* and slave children, see Bradley, "Wetnursing at Rome." On the *paedagogium*, see Mohler, "Slave Education in the Roman Empire;" cf. Gérard Boulvert, *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le haut-empire romain: rôle politique et administratif* (Naples, 1970), pp. 82, 177. For Pliny, *Ep.* 7.27.13; cf. Maxey, *Occupations of the Lower Classes*, p. 57.

for reasons of social emulation, once moderate wealth or small-scale slave ownership had been secured.

VII

When Nero died in A.D. 68, his remains were deposited in his family tomb by his nurses Egloge and Alexandria. It is not known how they had spent their lives since the emperor's childhood, but in rather impressive fashion C. Caecina Tuscus, the son of one of Nero's nurses, had become prefect of Egypt in the mid-sixties, though he was subsequently exiled, as too was Anicetus, who spent the rest of his life in comfortable banishment in Sardinia following his role in Nero's divorce of Octavia in 62. Equally unknown is the fate of Beryllus, and of the barber and dancer whom Nero had known in his aunt's household.⁶⁶

Nero's childhood attendants are on record principally because of Nero's notoriety, and in other circumstances even their very existence might well have gone unnoticed. Many names of other unimportant people have been collected in this paper, for whom also no more than fragments of information are available. They are people whose impact on history in any conventional sense was minimal, part of the great mass of "the silent and the submerged" who will always remain little more than names, and yet the collocation of their identities, and the establishment of a context in which they worked, has resulted in information which allows greater awareness to emerge of the structure of the Roman family and of the experience of childhood in Roman society. From infancy to adulthood, the life of the Roman child was affected by the ubiquitous presence of child-minders who were selected to provide children with basic wants and needs, and it is now clear that many of these people were men: child care, as distinct from education, was not exclusively a concern of women at Rome and that fact is of significance for the history of Roman childhood. But whether male or female, the child-minders tended to be of servile stock, people at the disposal of the socially prosperous who were able to take advantage of Rome's slavery system for various reasons. Moreover, it would seem that childhood itself was subject to strains and tensions from the outset: the children

66. For Egloge and Alexandria, see Suet. *Nero* 50 (Nero's mistress Acte is also included), and observe Suet. *Nero* 42.1 for reference, in 68, to an anonymous *nutricula*. For C. Caecina Tuscus, see Bradley, *Commentary*, pp. 215-216; cf. Brunt, "Administrators of Roman Egypt," p. 143. For Anicetus, see Tac. *Ann.* 14.62.

of the elite were distanced from their parents by the demands of society upon the latter, and slave children had no guarantee of continuous contact with their parents at all. Within the dislocated experience of childhood which followed, however, the child-minders functioned as surrogate parents, providing a continuity and stability that went beyond the provision of material needs, and they themselves were able to benefit through acquiescence to the responsibilities to which they were assigned. Any definition of the Roman family, therefore, must recognize the largely silent contribution of the child-minders, whose emotional importance can only be glimpsed but whose presence is unmistakable.

Appendix

A. *Nutritores* / *Nutricii*

40. L. Passienus Caricus (7271; cf. 33249). He made a brief dedication to Passiena Proba, conceivably but not necessarily his daughter. The inscription comes from the Monumentum Passienorum, so both persons were probably freed, or descended from freed members of the *familia* of L. Passienus Rufus, cos. 4 B.C. See *RE* XVIII, 4 col. 2098.

41. M. Aurelius Liberalis (10766). He was the *nutritor* of the unnamed sons of P. Aelius Placentius, who made the dedication. Both men are free, the sons perhaps free born. The difference of *nomen* stands out.

42. P. Antonius Zmaracodus (10848). The inscription records burial provisions made by Aelia Arsinoe, Aelius Hilarus, Aelius Timotheus Iunior, P. Antonius Arsinous, and P. Antonius Marinus, for T. Aelius Timotheus, *pater*, the *nutritor*, themselves and their *liberti* / *ae*. The *nutritor* could be regarded as the *libertus* of a full family group.

43. M. Antonius Tyrannus (12023). He made a dedication to his *contubernalis*, Antonia Arete, for both of whom servile origins are highly probable; cf. Treggiari, "*Contubernales*," pp. 56, 68. They are described as "*nutricii* M. Antoni Flori."

44. Callimorfus (14083). The inscription gives only the name of a *nutritor*, for whom the single name suggests slave status.

45. Ti. Cl. Hermes (15104). He and Cl. Paterna made a dedication to their *alumnus*, M. Licinius Hermes. If the inscription is accurately transcribed, the *alumnus* was the son of M. Licinius Ianuarius and Licinia Agathe, and died at the age of two. The parents' shared *nomen* suggests servile origins, but because of the child's early age at death he may have been free born. Ti. Cl. Hermes and Cl. Paterna may also have been former slaves.

46. Crescentis (16574). He was the *libertus* of Ti. Claudius Proculus Ceryllicanus and the *nutricius* of this man's unnamed son. Use of a family dependant for a free-born child seems likely.

47. M. Publius (19547). The inscription commemorates two free boys, L. Serbilius (= Servilius) Eutychanus sen. and L. Serbilius (= Servilius) Eutychanus iun., and their mother Hortensia Firmi (*sic*). The mother's status is dubious; the father is unknown. But the

nutritor must be free.

48. Zethus ser. Caesaris Semnianus (20433). He received a dedication from Iunia Elate, his *contubernalis*, and his nursling, Cassia Blanda. Elate can be assumed to be a member of the imperial *familia*; cf. Boulvert, *Domestique et fonctionnaire*, p. 108 n. 108; p. 302 n. 214. But the *nomen* Cassia is odd for the *familia Caesaris*. Zethus' *agnomen* indicates that he had had another owner before entering the imperial household; cf. Boulvert, *Domestique et fonctionnaire*, pp. 16-17, 37 n. 215; Treggiari, "Contubernales," pp. 51, 65.

49. C. Marius C. l. Agathocles (21432). He received a dedication from his free-born but illegitimate nursling, Livia Sp. f. Pelasgia.

50. Q. Quintius Eutycheius (25302). He received a dedication from his nurslings Quintius Eutychianus and Quintia Victoria. The common *nomen* suggests membership in the same household, and the male *cognomina* suggest servile origins.

51. Verna Caes. n. ser. Neonianus (28593). His nursling, Memmia Tertulla, commemorated her *nutricius* and her mother, Memmia Panthera. Boulvert, *Domestique et fonctionnaire*, p. 326 n. 331 suggests that the *nutricius* was Memmia Tertulla's father, and Panthera could then be considered a freedwoman. But Neonianus could have been a slave in a Memmian household before entry to the *familia Caesaris*.

52. Apollonius (38598). He made a dedication to Manlia Niceph[oris] together with her parents, Helvius and Manlia Modesta. Since the daughter has her mother's *nomen*, the father is likely to be a slave, the mother perhaps a freedwoman. Apollonius appears to be a slave from his single name.

B. *Educatores*

53. L. Do[mitius] Heliodorus (4871). He received a dedication from Domitius Philetus interpretes Aug. n.; cf. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris*, p. 82 n. 6. Both men are free, probably freed.

54. Aelius Germanus (10174). He received a dedication from Aelius Nicetes. Both men are free, probably freed.

55. Aelius Provincialis Augg. lib. (15983). Together with Aelius Viator (below, no. 56), this man was commemorated by three people, Memphius, Iraenaes, and Renatus, the *alumni* of a woman named Coelia Palaestina, who was also commemorated. The *educatores* were clearly imperial freedmen, and Coelia Palaestina was free(d). The *alumni* were Coelia's heirs and so will have been free too, but they are likely to have originally been slaves.

56. Aelius Viator Augg. lib. (15983). See above, no. 55.

57. Licinius Polytimus libert. (27198). He was the freedman and *educator* of M. Terentius Paternus, who came from Spain and died at the age of eighteen.

C. *Paedagogi*

58. [M.] Fulvinius M. l. Alexander (4718). His inscription comes from the Monumentum Marcellae, but mentions no other people. Freed status is certain.

59. L. Maro[...] (7011). Only the function of pedagogue is preserved in the inscription.

60. Felix (7657). No other persons are mentioned in the inscription. Felix was perhaps a slave. Boulogne, *Paedagogus*, p. 65 posits Roman nationality.

61. C. Gargilius Haemon (8012). From the information preserved in his inscription, it emerges that C. Gargilius Haemon (considered Greek by Boulogne, *Paedagogus*, p. 65), was the pedagogue and freedman of C. Gargilius Proculus, who in turn was the son of an imperial freedman, C. Iulius Philagurus divi Aug. l. Agrippianus. According to Dessau (*ad ILS* 8486), Proculus seems to have entered a different *familia* from that into which he was born before Philagurus was set free, and Philagurus entered the *familia* of Augustus through the will of M. Agrippa. Agrippa died in 12 B.C., but given the element "divi Aug. l." Philagurus cannot have been manumitted before A.D. 14. It is probable that Proculus was put under the supervision of a pedagogue in the household of the Gargilii while still a slave (the Gargilii in *PIR*² are of no help for household identification), and that Proculus manumitted his pedagogue once having been set free himself.

62. Pothus Aug. lib. (8988 = 33756). He was commemorated by his daughter. His status as an imperial freedman is certain.

63. [Sec]undius (8990). The inscription is too fragmentary to allow interpretation. Cf. Boulvert, *Esclaves et affranchis*, p. 178 n. 597.

64. Acratus l. (9741). The inscription gives only the pedagogue's name, but his freed status is certain. Boulogne, *Paedagogus*, p. 65 posits Greek nationality.

65. [Q.] Aemilius Diadumenus (9742). This man was commemorated by Aemilia Entrop[e], mother of his charge, Faustus, and whose own mother was Aemilia Cedne. The shared *nomen* suggests three freed persons in a common household, with Faustus still perhaps being a slave. Boulogne, *Paedagogus*, p. 65 regards the pedagogue as Greek.

66. Q. Caedius Q. l. Agatho (9743). The inscription preserves only

the pedagogue's name and that of Caedia Q. l. Nice. The freed status of both persons is clear. Boulogne, *Paedagogus*, p. 65 posits Greek nationality.

67. [...]onis l. Charito (9744). The inscription is fragmentary, but the pedagogue's freed status is clear. Boulogne, *Paedagogus*, posits Greek nationality.

68. L. Ciartius Hyperes (9745). He was the pedagogue of L. Ciartius Scyrus, the *collacteus* of P. Ciartius Helops. All three individuals are free, but the shared *nomen* (and the *cognomina*) suggests freed status, and there may be a connection with "the obscure senator L. Clartius or Ciartius" (A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny* [Oxford, 1966], p. 511); cf. *PIR*² C 747; *RE* Supp. 1 col. 317.

69. Q. Cospius Q. l. Phyl (9746). He was commemorated by his wife, Cestia Epiphania, as was their son, Cestius Phylacio, who died at the age of nine. His freed status is clear. For upper-class Cestii see *PIR*² C 686-692, but no clear association can be posited.

70. Hilarius (9748). He was the pedagogue of a certain Celer. The single names suggest slave status for both persons.

71. [...]stidius Philemo (9750). The inscription is fragmentary, but the pedagogue was presumably free. Boulogne, *Paedagogus*, p. 65 posits Greek nationality.

72. Phoebus (9751). The inscription gives only the pedagogue's name. He was perhaps a slave. Boulogne, *Paedagogus*, p. 65 posits Greek nationality.

73. C. Cestilius Pasiphilus (33392). He was the pedagogue of a Cestilia, and was perhaps a freedman in charge of a free-born girl. The inscription is from the Monumentum Cestiliorum.

74. Nicephorus (33894). He set up a dedication to his charge, Rufus, who died at the age of 18 years, 7 months, 10 days. The single names suggest slave status.

75. Malchio Caesaris l. (37761a). The inscription gives minimal information, but the pedagogue's freed status is clear.

76. Sasa Lucian (37812a). The inscription gives only the pedagogue's name.

D. *Tatae*

77. C. Vibius Tyrannus (2334). The *tata* and *patronus* of C. Vibius Threptus, the son of Vibia Epiteuxis and the public slave Threptus. The child died at the age of five and was commemorated by his parents and *tata*. Tyrannus and Epiteuxis were perhaps *colliberti*, or Tyrannus may have been the patron of Epiteuxis. But C. Vibius

Threptus (named after his father?) is likely to have been born after Epiteuxis' manumission, given his early age at death.

78. C. Taurius Primitivus (5642). The *tata* of Arminia Gorgilla, the daughter of C. Arminius Aphrodisius and Valeria Gorgilla. The child died at the age of fifteen and was commemorated by her parents and *tata*. All the individuals are free, but *nomen* variation is apparent.

79. Arruntius Hermes (5941). The *tata* of Arruntia Hermione, who was commemorated by Hermes and her father Arruntius Hermias. The inscription comes from the Monumentum Arruntiorum, so all three individuals can be assumed *liberti*, or descendants of *liberti*, of L. Arruntius, cos. A.D. 6 (*PIR*² A 1130). Hermione's mother is not on record.

80. Narcissus (6703). The *tata* of Stertinia Maxima, daughter of Acratus and Molpe. The child died at the age of three and was commemorated by her *tata*, who, like the parents, seems to be a slave. It is possible in this case that the free child had become separated from her parents.

81. Cornelius Atimetus (10873). The *tata* of Aelius Primus and Aelius Ingenus, the sons of Aelia Data and Fructus. The sons died at the respective ages of twenty-three and twenty-four and, together with Fructus, were commemorated by Aelia Data and Cornelius Atimetus. They should be regarded as the free-born sons of a freed-woman. Given Fructus' death, it is possible that Atimetus was a step-father.

82. Anthus (11395). The *tata* of Alexander, the son of Marinus. The child died at five months and was commemorated by his father and *tata*. All three individuals look like slaves. Alexander's mother is not recorded.

83. C. Apisius C. l. Felix (12133). The *tata* of the free-born L. Apisius C. f. Saptia Capitolinus, the son of C. Apisius C. l. Epaphra and Oscia O. l. Primigenia. Felix could have been the *libertus* of Epaphra, or of Epaphra's own patron. Capitolinus also had a *nutrix*.

84. Epaphroditus (16578). The *tata* of Crescentilla, the daughter of Crescens and Soteris. The child died at the age of eleven and was commemorated by her parents and *tata*. All four individuals appear to be slaves.

85. Iulius Telesphor (16926). The *tata* of Silvin[...], the daughter of Domitius Apollonius and Do(mitia) Fortunata. The girl was commemorated by her *tata*, parents, brother (Silvanus), *mamma* (Cornelia S(p)es) and *tatula* (Threptus). Free status is clear for the *tata* and parents, but *nomen* variation is apparent.

86. Phoebus (18196). The *tata* of the free-born L. Flavius L. f. Anien. Saturninus, the son of (L.) Flav[ius Eu]hodus. The child died at the age of five and was commemorated by his *tata* and father. Phoebus was perhaps a slave. Saturninus' mother is not recorded.
87. Ofellio (19552). The *tata* of Hortensia Iusta, the daughter of Q. Hortensi(us) Perpetu(us). The girl died at the age of eight and was commemorated by her *tata*, father and brother (Communis). Ofellio appears to be a slave, but the father and daughter were clearly free. Iusta's mother is not recorded.
88. Amphio (20930). The *tata* of Iusta, the daughter of Hermes and Successa. The girl died at the age of sixteen and was commemorated by her parents and *tata*. All the individuals seem to be slaves.
89. [...]ius Fortunatus (23113). The *tata* of C. Numisius Felicissimus, the son of C. Numisius Theseus and Numisia Urbica. The child died at the age of four and was commemorated by his parents and *tata*. Fortunatus was free, but it is doubtful that he was a Numisius. The shared *nomen* suggests former servile status for the parents.
90. P. Farsuleius Isidorus (25301). The *tata* of C. Q(uintius) Hermias, apparent son of C. Q(uintius) Eufemus. The latter commemorated his wife, Aelia Tyche, who died at the age of fourteen, and Hermias, who died at the age of four. The *tata* and the *nutrix* Quintia Parthenope also participated in the dedication. Perhaps the best interpretation here is that Tyche was Hermias' mother and that she died in childbirth four years before her child. *Nomen* variation is apparent.
91. Ignotus (27259). The *tata* of Terentia Spe(s), who died at the age of three and was commemorated by her unnamed parents, grandmother, and *tata*.
92. L. Valerius Sabbio (27964). The *tata* of L. Valerius Capitolinus, the son of Pontia Veneranda and L. Valerius Acratus.
93. Hilarus (28906). The *tata* of Victor, the son of Mursine and Mercurius. The child died at the age of two and was commemorated by his parents and *tata*. All the individuals appear to be slaves. The inscription should be regarded as a duplicate of the fragmentary 22802, the probability of which has not been noticed.
94. L. Mummius Onesimus (34206). The *tata* of T. Aconius Karus, the son of Flavia Hygia and T. Aconius Blastus. *Nomen* variation is apparent.
95. Anthus M.M. ser(vus) (35530). The *tata* Ti. Iulius [...], the son of Terminalis and Iulia Euphrantice. The child died at the age of three and was commemorated by his parents, the *tata*, and Rhoxane, *mamma*. He was perhaps the free-born son of a *liberta*, unless a slave

manumitted very early. The father and *mamma* appear to be slaves, as Anthus certainly was.

96. Saloni^{us} Epictetus (36353). The *tata* of Silvia, the daughter of Claudius Protomachus and Claudia Damal. The child died at the age of three and was commemorated by her parents, *tata* and Aphrodisia, *mamma*.

97. Onesimus (38694). The *tata* of Galatia, the daughter of Syntrophus and Acte. The child died at the age of three; she and her parents were commemorated by Onesimus. Galatia may therefore have been an orphan. All the individuals appear to be slaves.